



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MARCUS G. THEODORE
466 SOUTH 500 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

COPY MAILED

APR 08 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Mike Katsanevas :
Application No. 09/611,073 : ON PETITION
Filed: July 6, 2000 :
Attorney Docket No. N/A :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), filed November 22, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is dismissed.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)."

This application became abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, on or before August 23, 2004. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on August 24, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on November 12, 2004.

A grantable petition to revive an abandoned application under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

(1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;

(2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(l);

(3) A showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable; and

(4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20 (d)) required pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section.

This petition lacks items (1) and (3), above.

Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

Regarding item (1):

Petitioner has submitted \$665.00 for the issue fee. On November 22, 2004, (the date of receipt of the instant petition), the

small entity issue fee increased to \$685.00. As any fee amount paid on or after November 22, 2004, was subject to the new fee, the issue fee submitted by petitioner on November 22, 2004 was insufficient. Please note, as of December 8, 2004, the small entity issue fee has changed to \$700.00. Accordingly, petitioner must submit an additional \$35.00.

Regarding Item (3):

Petitioner asserts that the delay was caused by the lack of notice by the Office that an insufficient issue fee was submitted by applicant on July 7, 2004.

Applicant was placed on notice as to the required fee in the Notice of Allowance (Notice), mailed May 21, 2004. It is the responsibility and burden of the applicants' to timely submit the required issue fee by the date indicated on the Notice.

Furthermore, please note, a delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP does not constitute an "unavoidable" delay. See Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987), Vincent v. Mossinghoff, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); Smith v. Diamond, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); Potter v. Dann, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891). A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to: (1) the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from Office employees; or (2) **the Office's failure to advise the applicant of any deficiency in sufficient time to permit the applicant to take corrective action.** See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985); see also In re Colombo, Inc., 33 USPQ2d 1530, 1532 (Comm'r Pat. 1994) (while the Office attempts to notify applicants of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction, the Office has no obligation to notify parties of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction).

Accordingly, the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 151 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
 Commissioner for Patents
 Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313

By FAX: (703) 872-9306
 Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window
 Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3228.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Ed T', followed by a long horizontal line.

Edward J. Tannouse
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions/Patent
United States Patent and Trademark Office